



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/471,030	12/23/1999	MASANORI WAKAI	35.C14127	6923

5514 7590 07/03/2003

FITZPATRICK CELLA HARPER & SCINTO  
30 ROCKEFELLER PLAZA  
NEW YORK, NY 10112

EXAMINER

EDOUARD, PATRICK NESTOR

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2654

DATE MAILED: 07/03/2003

9

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

# Office Action Summary

Application No.  
09/471,030

Applicant(s)  
WAKAI ET AL

Examiner  
Patrick N. Edouard

Art Unit  
2654



-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

## Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136 (a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

## Status

- 1) ☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11; 453 O.G. 213.

## Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-45 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above, claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-45 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claims \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

## Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.  
If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

## Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgement is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).  
a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some\* c) ☐ None of:  
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.  
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.  
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).  
\*See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgement is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e).  
a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgement is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

## Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). \_\_\_\_\_
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s). 7 6) ☐ Other:

Art Unit: 2654

## **DETAILED ACTION**

### ***Specification***

1. The lengthy specification has not been checked to the extent necessary to determine the presence of all possible minor errors. Applicant's cooperation is requested in correcting any errors of which applicant may become aware in the specification.
2. The title of the invention is not descriptive. A new title is required that is clearly indicative of the invention to which the claims are directed.

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102***

3. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

4. Claims 1, 12-17 and 20-22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Ohga et al (5,677,993).

As per claim 1, Ohga et al teach an information processing apparatus comprising (figures 1, 6 and 7):

Art Unit: 2654

input means for inputting a plurality type of information ( his CRT touch input unit 1, his speech input device 3, col. 3, lines 53-60); and

input analyzing means for analyzing a combination of at least two types of information input from said input means (figure 1, his input information analyzing unit , col. 1, line 50 to col. 2, line 23).

As per claim 12, Ohga et al teach wherein said input means can input key information (figure 1, his input units 1 and 3, col. 3, line 52-60).

As per claims 13, 16 and 17, Ohga et al teach wherein said input means can input character information by converting the key information.(his CRT touch input unit 1).

As per claim 14, Ohga et al teach wherein said input means can input speech information (His speech input device 3).

As per claim 15 Ohga et al teach wherein said input means can input character information by recognizing the speech information and converting the speech information into character information ( his information converting unit 33).

As per claims 20-22, Ohga et al teach further comprising input order storing means for storing an input order of information input from said input means, wherein said input analyzing means analyzes the combination of at least two types of input information in accordance with the input order stored in said input order storing means. (Figures 1, 6 and 7, his input information analyzing unit 9, col. 1, line 50 to col. 2, line 23).

Art Unit: 2654

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

5. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

6. Claims 2-11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ohga et al (5,677,993) in view of Jackson et al (6,292,767 B1).

As per claim 2, It is noted that Ohga et al teach the claimed invention but do not explicitly teach wherein said input analyzing means includes: "input information concept instance generating means for generating a concept instance from each piece of the input information"; and "concept instance unifying means for unifying a plurality of generated concept instances. However, these features are well known in the art as evidenced by Jackson et al who teach:

"input information concept instance generating means for generating a concept instance from each piece of the input information" ( figure 3, his interpretations 270, col. 3, lines 4-22); and

"concept instance unifying means for unifying a plurality of generated concept instances" (col. 3, lines 22-58, his user specification of application semantic comprising several computer resident files). Therefore, one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made would have it obvious to incorporate into the input information analyzing unit of Ohga

Art Unit: 2654

et al the user specification as taught Jackson et al because it would provide a development system that allow a developer to easily create natural language understanding systems.

As per claim 3, Jackson et al teach wherein the concept instance includes a type of a slot and an instance corresponding to the slot of the type ( col. 3, lines 4-22, his command type slot 340 with a value “transfer”)

As per claim 4, Jackson et al further comprising:

“a database for storing the input information and information necessary for generating the concept instance, in one-to-one correspondence”; ( figure 4b, his user specification of applications semantics , col. 3, lines 37 to col. 4, line 20); and

“retrieving means for retrieving information necessary for generating the concept instance corresponding to the input information, from said database, (col. 3, lines 45-57);

wherein said input information concept instance generating means generates the concept instance in accordance with the information retrieved from said database (col. 3, line 22 to col. 4, line 20).

As per claim 5, Jackson et al teach wherein said database stores a concept type, a rule necessary for the concept instance, and a rule necessary for a surface layer word, respectively corresponding to a surface layer character string. (col. 3, lines 22 to col. 4, lines 20, his slot definition file 420, his grammar file 430 and his slot classes 440)

As per claim 6., Jackson et al teach wherein said unifying means unifies the concept instances in accordance with the rules ( figures 4a and 4b, col. 3, line 22-57).

Art Unit: 2654

As per claim 7, Jackson et al teach wherein said database stores, as a definition of a concept, a slot type of a slot which the concept instance can have, and a rule which is required to be satisfied by the instance corresponding to the slot (figures 4a-4b, col. 3, lines 22-27, his slot definition file and his grammar file).

As per claims 8, Jackson et al teach wherein said unifying means unifies the concept instances in accordance with the rule designated by the definition of the concept corresponding to the type of the concept of the concept instance (col. 3, lines 22 to col. 4, lines 20)

7. Claims 18 and 19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ohga et al (5,677,993) in view of (Jackson et al ) as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of Namba et al (5,884,249).

It is noted that the combination teaches the claimed invention but does not explicitly teach wherein said input means can input handwritten information. However, this feature is well known in the art as evidenced by Namba et al who teach in figure 15, a graphic recognition section 143 which recognizes hand-written or printed characters of figures at col. 27, lines 38-67. Therefore, one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made would have found it obvious to incorporate into the system of the combination a graphic analyzer as taught by Namba

Art Unit: 2654

et al because it would provide an information processing apparatus which can extremely reduce the load of an operator in inputting information.

8. Claims 23-45 are the same in scope and content as claims 1-22 above and therefore are rejected under the same rationale.

9. Any response to this action should be mailed to:

Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks

Washington, D.C. 20231 or faxed to:

(703) 308-9051, (for formal communications intended for entry) Or:

(703) 305-9508 (for informal or draft communications, please label "PROPOSED" or "DRAFT")

Hand-delivered responses should be brought to Crystal Park 11, 2121 Crystal Drive, Arlington, VA., Sixth Floor (Receptionist).

6. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Patrick N. Edouard whose telephone number is (703) 308-6725. The examiner can normally be reached on Tuesday-Friday from 07:30 a.m.-6:00 p.m.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Marsha Banks-Harold, can be reached on (703) 305-4379.

The facsimile phone number for this Art Unit is (703) 305-9508. Alternatively, facsimile messages may be sent directly to (703) 305-9644 where they will be stored in the examiner's voice mailbox




Art Unit: 2654

.(telling the examiner that a fax was received) and be automatically printed (i.e. - no delay by the examiner).

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application should be directed to the Group receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 305-3900.

Patrick N. Edouard

June 26, 2003



**PATRICK N. EDOUARD**  
**PRIMARY EXAMINER**